

Independent claims 4 and 11 are directed to low-pin-count chip packages each comprising a semiconductor chip and a plurality of connection pads electrically coupled to the chip. A package body is formed over the semiconductor chip and the connection pads using known plastic molding methods such as transfer molding.

Claims 4 and 11 specifically require that

(a) the die pad and the connection pads have a **concave profile** for enhancing the "locking" of the die pad and the connection pads to the package body as well as prolonging the path and time for moisture to diffuse into the package (see also page 4 lines 13-15 of the specification); and

(b) a portion of the die pad and a portion of each connection pad **extend outward from the bottom** of the package body so as to enhance stand-off and solderability thereof (see also page 4 lines 16-17 of the specification).

None of the above limitations are found in Hwang.

Furthermore, the Examiner mischaracterized many teachings of the applied reference, and did not exactly specify where in the '062 patent other claimed features of the instant invention may be found. For example, element 10 taught by Hwang is directed to a lead frame strip instead of "package" or "package body" as alleged by the Examiner. Material 42 taught by Hwang is directed to copper alloys or Nickel alloy usually employed as lead frame compositional material instead of "metal coating" as alleged by the Examiner.

Applicants also have carefully reviewed the applied reference and still failed to locate any teachings which could read on claims 5-7 and 12-14. For example, nowhere did the '062 patent teach or suggest a lead frame with a metal coating comprising a layer of nickel covering the surface of the die pad and the connection pads, and a layer of gold or palladium covering the nickel layer as recited in claims 5 and 12. Col. 3, par. 3 of the '062 patent relied upon by the Examiner for this

claimed feature only discloses the standard electrode potentials of important metals. It is not clear from the language of the Office Action where in the '062 patent, the limitation of claims 6 and 13 may be found. Clarification is respectfully requested.

For the overwhelming reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 4-7 and 11-14 is not well grounded and should be withdrawn.

Allowance of claims 4-7 and 11-14, in absence of other, more relevant art, is believed appropriate and therefore courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP



Benjamin J. Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: March 11, 2002  
BJH/lcw